



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II. THE USE AND RANGE OF THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.

The Future Participle in Latin abounds in interest alike to the student of Morphology, of Syntax, and of Style. Tho there may be some doubt regarding the circumstances attending its birth and that of its associates,¹ there can be little doubt regarding the multiplicity and variety of its stylistic activities when once it attained its maturity. In the complexity of its

¹ For the divergent views regarding the origin of the fut. part. and of the fut. infin. cf. Stolz, *Formenlehre** (1910), pp. 299 and 297. It is to be noted that Sommer, who in the 1st ed. of his *Handbuch*, p. 649, had held the view that 'the fut. part. was probably in the highest degree derived from the fut. infin.', in the 3d ed. (1914), p. 612, says: "eine sichere Erklärung der Bildung auf *-urus* fehlt", and on p. 595 refers to Postgate's view of the origin of the fut. infin. as "nicht frei von Bedenken". It should also be noted that Postgate, *Class. Rev.* XVIII (1904), p. 455, says: "on the whole I am inclined to believe that the fut. part. and the fut. infin. are of independent origin". Cf. also Kühner-Holzweissig, I (1912), pp. 696 and 706, and Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, pp. 537 and 540, and Sjögren, *Zum Gebr. des Futurums* (1906), p. 197. The last-named scholar says: "die sog. coniugatio periphrastica auf *-urus sum*, deren Herkunft noch unaufgeklärt ist." However, for the purposes of this investigation it has seemed advisable to proceed from the assumption that the various steps in the development of the fut. part. were somewhat as follows, using *facturus* as an illustration: to the indeclinable fut. infin. *facturum* was added, after the analogy of *factum esse*, an *esse*: from the indeclinable form *facturum esse* was developed, after the analogy of *factum*, *-am*, *-um esse*, a declinable *facturum*, *-am*, *-um esse*. This was not only an easy step from the preceding but an important one, inasmuch as from the first part, an accusative, could easily be formed a nominative, *facturus*, *-a*, *-um*, from the *esse* could easily arise an *est*, and from the combination of the two, *facturus*, *-a*, *um est*, i. e. the First Periphrastic combination, being assisted in its birth by such forms as *factus*, *-a*, *um est*. This new combination was soon widely used and given various meanings, and when, through the not uncommon ellipsis of *est* in other combinations, the independent form *facturus*, *-a*, *-um* came into existence, which had a parallel in the independent form *factus*, *-a*, *-um*, it assumed not only the various shades of meaning found in the first periphrastic and in the other participles, but took on others also.

nature, in the range of its use, in the versatility of the rôles it assumes, it stands unrivaled among the other parts of speech. "In its life it plays many parts," as many and as varied, one may almost say, as are the feelings and emotions. This is its striking characteristic. The addition of the personal touch to the narrative, the appeal to the interest and sympathy of the reader, the introduction of the dramatic element, the feeling of suspense, of uncertainty regarding the final accomplishment of the purpose announced, all combine to make the Future Participle one of the most effective means of adding life and interest to the style.

For centuries, however, the stylistic possibilities of the future participle lay dormant.¹ With the appearance of Ovid came the great awakening. As a master of technique, with the vision of the artist, he saw its latent possibilities, and straightway there were given to the Latin world many new and varied nuances of expression. His gifted contemporary, Livy, was also alive to its possibilities, and in the hands of these two artists² the future participle was brought to its highest development.

The varied uses of the future participle followed two different lines of development, depending upon the character of the creative impulse. The one may be designated as subjective, the other objective; in the one the action is voluntary, within the control of the actor, in the other involuntary, beyond his control; or to still vary the phrase, in the one, the force is acting from within, in the other, acting from without. On the subjective side, we may express in English³ its force by saying

¹ According to Bennett, *Synt. of Early Latin*, I, p. 435, but two occurrences of this usage are found in this period, one in Plaut. (a Grecism), the other in C. Gracchus.

² Kühner,² II, 1. p. 760, disregards Ovid's usage and says "seit Livius". Of Livy it may be said that he used it from choice, for its stylistic effect, while in the case of Ovid it should be noted that the fut. part. often furnished him with a convenient rhythmical form. Notice the frequent use of it in the fifth and sixth feet. Cf. *futurus* p. 283.

³ Whether the fut. part. was as carefully analyzed and differentiated in the Roman mind as the above analysis would indicate cannot in the very nature of the case be said with certainty. It is believed, however, that these different forces were actually felt and that the various shades of meaning in their Latin equivalents were present in his mind.

that the person was first represented as 'being about to' perform an action, and from this was developed, 'going to, on the point of, soon to, with the intention of,' becoming, with a slight shift, 'likely to, ready to, prepared to, able to'; then assuming a stronger force, 'determined to', 'resolved to', and finally denoting, 'with the purpose of', expressing the purpose of the action. From the objective side the reverse ideas were developed, the action now being represented as, 'with a tendency to, destined to, doomed to,' and finally having the equivalence of a subordinate clause, 'that is to, that should' etc., or even of a principal clause. The germs of some of these uses of the fut. part. were already present in its use with *est*, but not, it is to be noted, in its use with *esse*. In other words the "first periphrastic", and not the infinitive, had an influence in the development of the various uses and shades of meaning of the future participle as such.

I. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH ESSE.

Here the facts of usage speak in no uncertain tones. The frequent and widespread "omission" of *esse* shows that it was not considered a vital and essential part of the future infinitive. The combined usage of Plautus and Terence¹ shows the form without *esse* in about 80% of the total number of occurrences. In classical prose the same percentage prevails (without *esse* 1070, with *esse* 265), and in the prose of the Silver Age the omission is even greater, 92% (without 2035, with 172). It is to be further noted that the form with *esse* was never used by the poets, with but two exceptions, Ovid (Pont. 4. 6. 26, a pentameter) and Martial (8. 81. 9, a Phalaecean). It is also significant that the following prose writers do not use the form with *esse* at all: Sallust² (Cat., Jug. (53); but Ep. Mith. 10: *urum esse*); Hirtius (7); Nepos (73); Varro, L. L. (2); Vitruvius (4); Bell. Afr. (14); Vell. (22); Mela (1); Frontinus (32); and Tacitus (110). The fact that the form with *esse* is read but once, contrary to the general usage, in the latest texts, renders its occurrence suspicious, if not doubtful, in

¹For these two writers both Sjögren, p. 96, and Postgate adopt Leopold's statistics: without *esse* 174 times, with *esse* 44 times.

²The number of times each uses the form without *esse* is put in parenthesis.

Sen., Contr. 7. 6. 15 (79); Val. Max. 6. 5. 2 (47; Halm reads *sese*); Petron. 110 (18); Pliny, Nat. 9. 71 (30); Quint. 4. 2. 128 (40) [in Quint., Dec.: without *esse* 36, with *esse* 4 (*futurum*)] and Suet., Vesp. 5. 6 (*esset v. l.*) (77). In only two writers is the form with *esse* used oftener than that without *esse*, Bell. Hisp. (with: 13. 3; 19. 4; 5; 29. 6; without 19. 6; 22. 5) and Celsus (with 39. 35; 42. 9; 31; 52. 11 all *futurum*; without 35. 21; 85. 8). Cicero in his archaic *De Legibus* does not use *esse* at all; but, in general, in each of his other literary works the forms without *esse* amount to about 71%. Caesar's attitude toward these two forms is shown by the fact that he uses the form without *esse* in 93.1% of the total (164-12).¹ Livy's preference for the form without *esse* was similarly marked,² 90% (1101-107), and Pliny's, Ep. 90.1% (55-5); but these two writers are not so decided in their preference as Sen. phil., 96.5% (139-5), Apul. 96.4% (53-2) and Justin. 98.1% (104-2).³ The preference of Curt. 77.5% (103-30) and Gell. 77.3% (17-5) is not so marked.⁴

The use of the future infinitive belongs particularly to certain forms of literature, certain kinds of narrative resorting but little to indirect quotation. It is not used at all (excluding *fore* and *futurum*) by such poets as Lucr., Pers., and Juv.; but rarely by such as Sen. trag. (once in 430 pp.), Statius 4 (176.8 pp.);⁵ but more often by Lucan 4 (81. 5), Hor. 5 (52. 4), Catull. 2 (36. 5), Mart. 11 (31. 2), Verg. 15 (23. 7); and most often by Plaut. 144 (8. 6), Ter. 74 (4. 5), and Ovid 48 (19. 9). In prose it was used most rarely by such technical and impersonal writers as Celsus 2 (181), Vitruv. 3 (87),

¹ Rice Holmes, Caes., B. G. (1914), omits the *esse* in 5. 29. 2 and 7. 75. 5.

² In the *Periochae* the form with *esse* = 0, without = 11.

³ In Sen. *esse* is used: Dial. 2. 3. 2; 11. 11. 1; Ben. 1. 10. 3; Ep. 59. 14; 117. 28; in Apul.: Phil. 62. 27; 93. 12; in Just. 6. 3. 7; 21. 1. 2; in Gell. 2. 24. 2; 6. 18. 3; 12. 11. 2; 13. 24; 13. 5. 4.

⁴ It may be noted here that the list of citations for the use of the protasis in the Abl. Abs. given by Kühner², II, 1, p. 776, is far from complete; cf. e. g. Cic., Att. 1. 16. 5; 13. 27. 1; 31. 3; 15. 20. 4; Ovid, Met. 3. 287; Livy, 24. 18. 2, etc.

⁵ The numbers in parenthesis indicate the rate of one occurrence per so many Teubner pages.

Varro, L. L. 2 (85. 5), and Pliny, Nat. 31 (61); most often by the historians, Nepos 73 (1. 5), Livy 1208 (1. 6), Caesar 176 (1. 9), Curtius 133 (2. 1), Sallust 53 (2. 3), Just. 106 (2. 3), Suet. 78 (3. 3), Tac. 110 (5. 5), Frontinus 32 (4. 5); but not so often by Florus 4 (26. 3). Cicero uses it most often in his Epist. 437 (2. 6), and Orat. 348 (4. 6); least often in Rhet. 56 (10. 2) and Phil. 138 (8. 2).¹

A. FUTURUM (ESSE) AND FORE.

Fore is in general used more often than *futurum*, its relative frequency being represented in Plaut. and Ter.² by 69%, in Classical Latin by 66%, and in the Silver Age by 63%. From the point of view of preference for one of these expressions the various writers may be classified under six categories. a) Those who use only *fore*: Hirtius (3), Varro, L. L. (2), Florus (1), Catullus (2), Tibullus (4), Val. Fl. (1) and Juvenal (1), all poets except one. b) Those who use only *futurum*: Vitruvius (3), Bell. Hisp. (1) and notably Sen. rhet. (22). c) Those, all poets, who use neither: Lygd. etc., Prop., Phaedrus, Sen. trag., Lucan, Persius, and Martial. d) Those who use *fore* oftener than *futurum*: Plaut. (48-22), Ter. (18-8), Sall. C., J., (26-1), Cic. (304-162), Caes. (39-15), Nepos (15-13), Bell. Afr. (5-2), Livy (277-101, decreasing from 78.2% in the 1st dec. to 61.1% in the 5th), Curt. (26-18), Pliny, Nat. (11-4), Quint. (10-6), Quint., Decl. (9-5), Gell. (5-2), Verg. (8-4), Hor. (6-1), Ovid (14-5), Sil. Ital. (4-1), Stat. (2-1). Of the eighteen writers who use both, the greatest contrast is shown in Tacitus, who uses *fore* 70 times to *futurum* only once. In all *fore* was used over twice (893) as often as *futurum* (372). e) Those who prefer *futurum* to *fore*, all prose and belonging to the Silver Age (exc. Lucr.): Vell. (3-1), Val. Max. (18-4), Celsus (2-1), Sen. phil. (33-4), Frontinus (4-2), Pliny, Ep. (9-6), Suet. (7-6), Just. (19-18), Apul. (14-7), and Lucr.

¹ *Fut. infin.*: Sen., Troad. 637; Stat., Th. 1. 343; 2. 199; 7. 765; 8. 792; Lucan, 5. 307; 8. 574; 9. 554; 555; Hor., C. 4. 9. 1; S. 1. 3. 123; Ep. 2. 1. 17; 226; 266; Catull. 36. 7; 42. 4; Vitruv., Pr. 3; 1. 1. 18; 10. 16. 7; Varro, L. L. 8. 51; 9. 115; Celsus, 35. 21; 85. 8.

² Cf. Sjögren, *l. c.* p. 57.

(4-3). f) Those who show no preference: one writer, Petronius (1-1).¹

B. FUTURUM ² UT AND FORE UT.

These two expressions are in general used for rhetorical effect; i. e., from choice and not from necessity (on account of a missing supine stem).³ In the earlier period ⁴ they were rarely used (Plaut., Ter.: 3); but in classical Latin they are used more freely, 102 times, most often by Cicero (70) and Caesar (14). In the Silver Age they are used only 76 times, notably by Sen. rhet. (10), Livy (10), and Tacitus (10). Their absence from poetry, except in Lucretius (4) and Ovid (2), is noteworthy.⁵ They are used relatively most frequently by Caes. (1 in 24. 3 pp.), Sen. rhet. (1 in 52. 6), and Cic. (1 in 63. 7). The opposite tendency is shown by Livy 10 (1 in 194. 6 pp.), Sen. phil. 1 (1 in 1496) and Pliny, Nat. (1 in 1892). In these three periods *fore ut* ⁶ is used more often (132) than *futurum ut* ⁷ (58), being represented in Plaut. and Ter. by 67%, in the Classical period by 87.3%, but in the Silver Age dropping to 42.1%.

Five categories are represented: a) Those using only *fore ut*: Plaut. (1), Sall. (5), Varro, L. L. (2), Vitruv. (2), Quint.

¹ Rarer occurrences: *futurum*, once: B. Hisp. 19. 4, Sall., Jug. 87. 4; Hor., Ep. 1. 7. 1; Sil. 17. 405; Stat., Th. 2. 199; Tac., Ann. 14. 48; Petron. 108; (Gell. 2. 16. 9; 29, 15); *fore*, once: Vell. 1. 12. 6; Celsus, 85. 9; Petron. 3; Val. Fl. 4. 476; Juv. 13, 200; Florus, 1. 1. 7.

² In this formula, it is to be noted, *futurum* appears without *esse*, except in Cic., De Div. 1. 101 and Caes., B. G. 1. 31, 11 (Kühner,² II, 1, p. 710, 8, needs revision).

³ To Kühner, *ibid.* p. 711, add: Nepos, 14. 6. 4; Livy, 41. 8. 7; Val. Max. 2. 9. 6; 7. 2 ext. 2; 8. 14 ext. 4; Celsus, 230. 35; Pliny, Nat. 17. 263; Tac., H. 3. 32. 17; Quint., Decl. 58. 24.

⁴ *Fore ut*: Plaut., Ps. 1319; Ter., Hec. 99: *futurum ut*: Ter., And. 508.

⁵ *Fore ut*: Lucr. 3. 486; 871; Ovid, Her. 16. 277; *futurum ut*: Lucr., 3. 871; 4. 805; Ovid, Am. 2. 18. 49.

⁶ *Fore ut*: note especially its use in Sall., J. 8. 1; 61. 4; 100. 1; 111. 1; 112. 3; Varro, L. L. 10. 51 *bis*; Vitruv. 2. 1. 3; 9 pr. 13; Quint. 6. 1. 29; Quint., Decl. 188. 31; Just. 5. 3. 3, and Gell. 5. 10. 9; 5. 1. 3; 9. 3. 5.

⁷ Note that Cicero uses *fut. ut* only twice (Caec. 4; De Div. 1. 101), Livy only 3 times (1. 53. 11; 9. 10. 5; 41. 8. 7), Tac. only once (Hist. 3. 32), Suet. only once (Aug. 97. 2). On the contrary Quint., Decl. uses *fore ut* only once (188. 31).

(1), Just. (1), and Gell. (3). b) Those using only *futurum ut*: Nepos (3), Sen. rhet. (10), Sen. phil. (1), Pliny, Nat. (1), Frontinus (3), and Pliny, Ep. (4). c) Those preferring *fore ut*: Cicero (68-2), Caes. (9-5), Livy (7-3), Tac. (9-1) and Suet. (7-1). d) Those preferring *futurum ut*: only one, Quint., Decl. (14-1). e) Those showing no preference: Ter. (1-1), Celsus (1-1), Ovid (1-1) and Lucr. (2-2).

Note also that *fore qui* is used by Sall., Jug. 43, *fore aliquem qui* by Cic., De Or. 1. 95, *fore ne* begins with Celsus 95. 16 and Val. Max. 6. 4. 3, *futurum ne* with Val. Max. 1. 1. 8.

C. FORE AND FUTURUM WITH PARTICIPLES.¹

a) *Present*: cf. Kühner,² II, 1. p. 159 and note: Cic., Fam. 14. 4. 6 quem spero fore observantem (part. adj.).

b) *Future*: not found until Late Latin and very rare; cf. *ib.* p. 163 and Schmalz, Synt.⁴ p. 463. For its use with *foret* cf. p. 276.

c) *Perfect* with *fore*: Several occurrences are to be added to Kühner, *ib.* p. 165: to the one cited from Plaut. add Cas. 54; and for Ter. (not cited) Hec. 398; to the 4 in Cic. (in Neue 23 cited), Verr. 2. 1. 103; Piso 78 (i. e. in Orat. 11, in Epist. 10); to 1 cited by both for Sall., Jug. 14. 4; 85. 26; to the 2 cited for Livy (5 by Neue), 2. 34. 11; 44. 3; 4. 6. 4; 5. 2. 3; 23. 44. 2; 26. 12. 13; 27. 16. 2; 43. 10. 2 (Livy, 13 in all). This usage is also found in Val. Max. 5. 6 ext. 4; Curt. 4. 7. 28; 29; Apul., Met. 251. 17; Phil. 185. 2 (in Ovid, A. A. 1. 425, Caes. 4. 6. 3 and Hirt. 22. 2. part. adjs. are found).

With *futurum*: cited by both Neue and Kühner¹ in only one passage, Cic., Verr. 1. 24. Note also its use in Plaut., Asin. 454 solutam futuram; Cic., Fam. 7. 16. 3 nummatum futurum.²

d) *Gerundive* with *fore*: forms like *mittendos fore* did not make their appearance until Livy, who uses this construction

¹Cf. Neue, Formenlehre,⁴ p. 152, Seyffert, B. ph. Woch. 18, p. 1533, and Sjögren, *l. c.* p. 62.

²In Val. Max. 4. 1 ext. 8 *futuri oppositi* (so Kempf), the text is corrupt. Cf. crit. note. Here, however, *oppositi* is to be regarded as adjectival (=adversi), paralleled by a similar use of *obiecti* in the next clause.

5 times (5. 30. 1; 31. 11. 7; 36. 27. 7; 37. 39. 2; 38. 59. 11).¹ Curtius uses it twice (3. 8. 19; 4. 5. 5) and Celsus once (I pr. = p. 6. 34). Compare its use with *foret* p. 276.

D. FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH FUISSE.²

The expression *-urum fuisse* first came into use in the Classical period, and was not used at all in poetry. Two writers are conspicuous for the frequency with which they make use of this expression, Cicero who uses it 90 times (most often in the Orat. (41), Phil. (23), Epist. (19), least often in Rhet. (7)) out of the total 99 in the Classical period; and Livy, who uses it over half (63 times) out of a total 109 for the Silver Age. Next to these two writers, *sed longo intervallo*, comes Curtius with 11 occurrences, and Quintilian with 6, Caes., Tac., and Gell. each using it 5 times. For its use with *videor* cf. p. 270.

E. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH FUISSE UT.

This rare form of expression is found only in Caes., B. C. 3. 101. 2 and Cic., Tusc. 3. 69 (Cic., Lig. 34 has *prius futurum fuisse quam* ut, differing from the others).

F. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH VIDEOR.

This usage is much more common in prose (195) than in poetry (11), being used by only five poets, Lucil. (1), Cat. (1), Ov. (8), Stat. (1), and Mart. (but in prose).³ It is used more frequently by Cicero than by any other writer (94). It is a significant fact that there are only two writers who insert an

¹ Kühner² II, 1, p. 168, cites 3 passages in Livy and adds "u. ö.", referring to W.-M. 5. 30. 1. But here *foret* is also included, for which Kühner's "u. ö." is appropriate enough.

² Rarer uses: Sall., I. 82. 3; Caes. I. 34. 2; 5. 29. 2; 6. 41. 3; 43. 5; B. C. 3. 101. 3; Nepos 9. 1. 3; 2. 3; 17. 6. 1; Sen. rhet. S. 2. 22; C. 10. 5. 27; Vell. 2. 37. 3; Val. Max. 3. 2. ext. 1; 8. 1. absol. 9; 9. 4. 2; Celsus, 9. 8; Sen., Dial. 5. 22. 5; Plin., Nat. 7. 110; 28. 25; Quint. 2. 16. 9; 4. 2. 38; 5. 6. 10; 10. 2. 7; 11. 1. 27; 12. 1. 20; Tac., Ann. 2. 31; 71; 14. 29; 15. 35; Hirt. 1. 50; Plin., Ep. 4. 22. 6; 5. 13. 4; 8. 6. 12; Pan. 7. 1; Suet., Iul. 56. 4; Aug. 31. 3; Otho 10. 1; Just. 29. 3. 2; Gell. 10. 16. 11; 12. 5. 6; 13. 29. 2; 18. 5. 6; 20. 2. 53; Apul., Apol. 66. 10; Curt. 4. 14. 7; 5. 7. 11; 12. 1; 6. 8. 10; 28; 10. 18; 7. 5. 39; 6. 6; 10. 6; 8; 9. 6. 12.

³ Cf. Lucil. 314; Cat. 48. 4; Ovid, Her. 4. 36; 129; A. A. 1. 449; Rem. 416; Met. 4. 343; 526; 606; 8. 348; Stat., Th. 6. 544, and Mart. I pr. (prose).

esse in this expression,¹ Cicero (23) and Quintilian, Decl. (1). With these 24 occurrences contrast the use of the fut. participle without *esse*, 181 times. As Cicero's usage is contrary to that of all the other writers in adding an *esse*, it deserves special attention. The fact that he "omits" an *esse* over three times as often (71) as he inserts it (23), that he frequently uses an adjective in this construction, the *pres.* part. also, as Planc. 55 *retinens videtur*, the *perf.*, as Font. 28 *retenta videatur*, points to some special reason for this exceptional usage. An examination of the passages will show that this exception is to be accounted for by the laws he formulated for the rhythmical clausula of his periods.²

Note also the use of the fut. part. with the infinitival form *videri* in: Caes., B. C. 1. 2. 1. *eum facturum videri*; Ovid, Met. 9. 606 *potui moritura videri*; and in Curt. 5. 13. 11; Sen., Ben. 6. 23. 1; Quint., Decl. 218. 24. It may also be noted that with *videor* Cicero uses both *fore* and *futurum* (in Epist. *fore* about 7 times as often as *futurum*).

With *fuisse*: *-urus fuisse* with *videor* is very rare, being found in only three writers, Cicero using it 3 times (De Or. 2. 230; 3. 180; Lig. 24), Brutus (Ad Brut. 1. 6. 2) and Livy 5 times (26. 23. 2; 44. 4. 4; 34. 4. 14; 38. 50. 1; 39. 40. 4).³

Videor is also occasionally found with the gerundive, as Tac., Hist. 1. 4 *repetundum videtur*; 33 *festinandum videbatur*.

II. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE WITH EST,⁴ ETC.

This form of expression, the so-called First Periphrastic Conjugation, whatever its ultimate origin, was one of the first

¹ Quint., Dec. 291. 26 *ut videatur esse aliquid—habiturus*. Cf. Frontinus Str. 4. 5. 13 *dicerentur esse facturi*.

² Of the 23, six are of the type *esse videatur* (Fam. 1. 8. 1; Cat. 2. 20; Sest. 10; 106; N. D. 2. 55; 3. 19); 12 are like *esse venturus* in rhythm (De Or. 1. 11; 2. 31; 85; ad Q. Fr. 1. 4. 4; Att. 2. 16. 1; 4. 16. 5; 6. 1. 3; 15. 2. 2; Fam. 16. 12. 4; Fin. 2. 28; 3. 47; Cato M. 71); 3 are like *visurus esse* (double trochee) (Att. 4. 16. 7; 12. 14. 3; Brut. 18). In the two remaining we have a double cretic-trochee combination (Phil. 11. 6) and the heroic clausula (Att. 10. 17. 3).

³ Similar constructions with other verbs may here be noted as Cic., Inv. 2. 74 with *negabitur*; 78 with *arbitrentur*; Att. 17. 14. 2 with *dicebantur* (Cf. Plaut., Truc. 85) and Ovid, Pont. 2. 3. 59 with *putetur*.

⁴ For a careful discussion of the nature and use of such forms cf. Steele, Class. Phil. VII, pp. 457 f.

to find an extended use. Even in early Latin it had already developed five distinct uses, representing an act as intended, on the point of happening, destined to occur, and expressing a resolve, and mere futurity.¹ The table on p. 272 will show at a glance the relative frequency with which each Mood and Tense is used from Plautus to Apuleius, together with the detailed usage of some of the important writers. The Fut. Perf. Indic., being non-existent, is not recorded.

It will be noted that this form of expression is used more often in prose than in poetry, and that, while there is no decided difference between the usage of Classical prose and Silver prose, there is a marked contrast between the usage of Classical poetry and that of Silver poetry. The usage of writers other than those mentioned above is as follows:² Auct. Her. 20 (5. 7); Sall., C., J. 8 (15. 1); Nepos 11 (10. 3); Varro, L. L. 6 (29. 5); Vitruv. 23 (11. 3); Sen. rhet. 106 (4. 9); Vell. 7 (13); Val. Max. 37 (13); Celsus 20 (18. 1); Curt. 41 (6. 7); Mela 1 (79); Petron. 10 (16); Pliny, Nat. 22 (86); Quint. 107 (5. 2); Quint., Decl. 115 (3. 8); Frontinus 10 (14. 3); Suet., Vit. Caes. 5 (50. 8); Florus 3 (35); Just. 19 (13. 8); Gellius 18 (28. 8); in poetry: Lucr. 2 (99); Catull. 1 (73); Tib. 1 (35); Prop. 14 (8. 4); Phaedr. 2 (25); Lucan 8 (40. 7); Val. Flacc. 1 (197); Stat. 1 (707); Mart. 9 (38. 2); Juv. 2 (52. 5); and not at all in Persius (19 pp.) and Sil. It. (425 pp.).

With regard to the use of this periphrastic conjugation it may be said that it possessed one characteristic which commended itself to the popular mind. The fact that it eliminated all difficulties in deciding whether to use *-bo*, *-bis*, *-bit* or *-am*, *-es*, *-et* (for the confusion caused thereby cf. Neue, pp. 322 f.) played no small part in the extended use of it in the colloquial language. It is significant too that Cicero in his Letters used it at the rate of 1 in 3. 5 pages, but in his Rhet., 1 in 9. 3 pp., in his Orat. 1 in 7. 4 and Phil. 1 in 6. 5; that writers like Plaut. and Ter. use it at the rate of 1 in 9 pp., Ovid 1 in 9. 3, but Vergil

¹ Cf. Bennett, Synt. of Early Latin, I pp. 457 f. For Plautus' usage we have the statistics of Postgate (I. F. IV. p. 257) and Sjögren, *l. c.* p. 196 (those of the latter, as an independent investigation showed, being more accurate), and for Terence, Sjögren, *ibid.*

² The rate, one ex. in so many Teubner pages, is given in parenthesis.

	Indicative.						Subjunctive.						Relative Frequency.	
	Pres.	Impf.	Fut.	Perf.	Plupf.	Ind.	Pres.	Impf.	Perf.	Plupf.	Subj.	Total.	No. of pages.	i in pages.
Plautus	117	1	0	2	0	120	16	1	1	0	18	138	1,243	9.0
Terence	27	0	0	1	2	30	5	1	0	0	6	36	336	9.3
Cato agr.	0	0	11	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	1	12	86	7.2
Early Latin	144	1	11	3	2	161	22	2	1	0	25	186	1,665	8.9
Class. Prose.	200	62	13	18	1	294	396	155	17	7	575	869	5,700	6.6
Class. Poetry.	47	47	4	13	5	111	17	2	1	1	21	132	2,017	15.3
Class. Period.	247	109	17	31	6	405	413	157	18	8	596	1001	7,717	7.7
Silver Prose.	442	154	22	47	11	676	228	257	85	13	583	1259	11,192	8.9
Silver Poetry.	10	3	2	3	1	19	4	4	1	0	9	28	2,602	92.9
Silver Period.	452	157	24	50	12	695	232	261	86	13	592	1287	13,794	10.7
Cicero	171	53	7	18	1	250	375	134	17	5	531	781	4,460	5.7
Caesar	1	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	1	10	13	340	26.1
Vergil	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	356	118.7
Horace	4	2	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	4	10	262	26.2
Ovid	34	39	3	13	4	93	5	1	1	1	8	101	953	9.3
Livy	67	66	0	8	4	145	52	127	34	6	219	364	1,946	5.3
Sen. phil.	162	15	16	7	0	200	65	17	4	1	87	287	1,496	5.2
Tacitus	10	4	0	0	0	14	3	7	6	0	16	30	600	20.0
Pliny ep.	16	4	2	1	1	24	8	12	0	0	20	44	380	8.6
Suet.	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	4	5	254	50.8
Apuleius	7	2	0	0	0	9	2	2	0	0	4	13	642	49.3

1 in 118.7, Lucr. 1 in 99, and that of the 10 examples in Horace, 8 are in the Satires and Epodes (metrical considerations could not, it is maintained, account entirely for the difference in use). Such facts point to a colloquial origin and the conclusion that in the Classical period such forms were not regarded as appropriate for use in the higher forms of literature.

The fact, too, that in such an impersonal and technical work as that of Pliny the Elder it is used at the rate of 1 in 86 pp., but in the more lively narrative of Pliny the Younger it is used at the rate of 1 in 8.6 pp., not to mention other contrasts, shows that the character of the subject-matter must also be taken into consideration.

The table also shows that there was a growth in the use of the subjunctive; e. g., in Plaut. the indicative was used much oftener (120) than the subj. (18), but in Cicero the subj. (531) is used over twice as often as the indic. (250), in Caesar over three times as often. On the contrary, it is to be noted that in poetry from Plautus to Juvenal the indic. is almost invariably used oftener than the subj.; e. g., in Ovid 93-8, Prop. 8-5, Lucan 6-2, Mart. 6-3. Finally, the subj. was used oftener in Classical prose (1 in 9.9 pp.) than in Silver prose (1 in 19.2 pp.); with a still stronger contrast between Classical poetry (1 in 96) and Silver poetry (1 in 289.1).

POSITION OF THE NEGATIVE.

The position of the negative *non* is worthy of note. It may be said that in general such forms as *venturus est* were not considered as a unit. One point of evidence supporting this view is the fact that the two words are frequently separated, as, e. g., in Cic., Flacc. 3, where 16 words intervene, and in Balb. 52 were 7 words separate the two parts. Throughout the literature to Apuleius *non* shows a decided tendency to attach itself to the verb, the most common forms being *non est venturus* and *venturus non est* [similarly with *esse* (exc. Plaut., Cist. 236, M. G. 1411; Gell. 12. 11. 2) and *fuisse* (exc. Cic., Cael. 56)]. The only exceptions noted were Plaut., Bacch. 1004 *non laturus sum*; Capt. 14; but none in the Classical period, and but two in the Silver Age, Sen., Contr. exc. 8. 4 *non ausurus fuit* and Sen., Ben. 5. 21. 3 *non ablaturus ero, sed recepturus*; i. e., the exceptions are all in Plaut. and Silver Latin.

NOTEWORTHY TENSE FORMS.

I. INDICATIVE.

a) *Present*: This form is in general the one in most frequent use, in fact the only one used in the indicative by Varro, L. L., Bell. Afr., Mela, Lucr., Verg., Sen. trag., and Just.

b) *Imperfect and Perfect*: the former is generally used rather than the latter,¹ except in 8 writers, 4 being poets, 4 belonging to the Silver Age: Plaut. (1-2), Ter. (0-1), Petron. (0-1), Quint. (4-4), Celsus (0-1), Florus (0-2), Lucan (1-1), and Mart. (0-2). Note, however, Sen. rhet. (12-5), Val. Max. (10-1), Curt. (10-1), and see the table, p. 272.

The *Perfect* was late in being developed. Before the Classical period it was found only 3 times, twice in Plaut. (Asin. 621, Most. 437), and once in Ter. (Haut. 817), and in the Classical period there are only two writers that use it, Cicero (18: Rhet. 1, Orat. 10, Epist. 4, Phil. 3) and Ovid² (13). In the Silver Age it was used by 13 prose writers and by 2 poets, Lucan and Martial. The Perf. was used most often by Quint., Decl. 14 (1 in 31. 5 pp.), Ovid 13 (1 in 73. 3); Cicero 18 (1 in 247. 8).

¹ Blase, H. G. III, p. 275, says: "Umgekehrt ist bei den beiden Seneca *fui* vielleicht häufiger als *eram*". Note, however, that in both Senecas the form with *eram* is used over twice as often as that in *fui*: Sen. rhet., 12 to 5, Sen. phil. 15 to 7 (to the 2 cited for impf. add: Suas. 2. 3; 6. 22; Contr. pr. 17; 1. 1. 11 *bis*; 2. 20; 22; exc. 2. 5; exc. 6. 6; Lemma 9. 2. 24; and to the 3 for *fui* add: exc. 8. 4; 10 pr. 6; to 0 cited for *eram* in Sen. phil. add: Dial. 10. 17. 2; Ben. 3. 7. 6 *bis*; 11. 1; 5. 6. 2 *bis*; 6. 8. 3; Clem. 1. 9. 11; 15. 3; 18. 2; N. Q. 4 b, 5. 4; Epist. 79. 4; 91. 2; 110. 10; 121. 4; to the 2 cited for *fui* add: Dial. 6. 21. 4; Ben. 4. 35. 2; 6. 14. 4; Ep. 68. 12. For the perfect "im Hauptsatz" in Cic. add: Cat. 4. 17; Lig. 23 *bis*; 24; Fato 19 and to the 3 "im Nebensatz" add: Att. 14. 14. 2; Q. Fr. 1. 1. 23; Phil. 2. 88; Tusc. 1. 48; Div. 2. 20; Or. 1. 110 (i. e. in Cic. there are 9 in princ., 9 in subord. clauses).

² To the 8 cited by Blase, l. c. for the *perf.* in Ovid add: Am. 2. 14. 10; 18; Her. 2. 110; Trist. 4. 10. 79; Fast. 4. 613; to the 2 cited for Quint. add: 4. 1. 67; 5. 10. 47. To the 4 for the *perf.* cited for Livy add: 2. 1. 4; 38. 47. 4; 40. 10. 2; 14. 11; and to the 1 in Quint. add: 4. 15. 7; 7. 4. 2; 10. 1. 115; and to the 1 for Florus add: 1. 3. 11. The following uses of the *perf.* were not noted: Val. Max. 4. 7. 1; Curt. 7. 1. 39; Petron. 94; Quint., Decl. 37. 1; 54. 11; 119. 31; 132. 2; 146. 19; 297. 8; 302. 18; 310. 8; 341. 19; 367. 25 f. (5 times); Plin., Ep. 7. 27. 14; Celsus, 336. 30; Just. 1. 7. 10; Gell. 2. 22. 25 and Lucan 8. 97; Mart. 5. 34. 5; 10. 41. 5. For the use of the *perf.* etc. in conditional sentences cf. Thielmann, Archiv, II, pp. 188 f.

c) *Future*: to express futurity the form with the fut. part. and *est* seems to have satisfied all ordinary requirements, the double expression of futurity in the fut. part. and *erit*, which filled out the complete formal scheme, being reserved for a more energetic situation (compare the double comparative, etc.). A glance at the Table shows that forms like *facturus est* were used 843 times, while those like *facturus erit* were used only 52 times (11 being in Cato). The latter form was used by three writers before Cato,¹ by Cato (11), Auct. Her. (2), Cic. (7), Vitruv. (4), Celsus (1), Sen. phil. (16), Pliny, Nat. (1), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (2), and in poetry by Prop. (1), Ovid (3), and Mart. (2), most often relatively to the size by Cato (1 in 1. 8 pp.), and Sen. phil. (1 in 93. 5) (by Cic. only 1 in 637 pp.). Two instances are found in Livy (38. 38. 2; 8), but in these Livy is recording the terms of a treaty.

d) *Pluperfect*:² this form, next to the future, is the rarest of all (only 20 times in these 23,176 pp.). It was first used by Ter. (2), then not till Cic. (1), Tib. (1), and Ovid (4), Sen. rhet. (1), Livy (4), Quint., Decl. (2), Frontin. (1), Pliny, Ep. (1), Just. (2), and Mart. (1).

II. SUBJUNCTIVE: This mood is rarely used in principal clauses. Blase l. c. p. 275 says: "Nur ein solcher Konjunktiv im Hauptsatz ist mir bekannt, nämlich Val. Flacc. 7. 534." Three others are to be added: Ovid, Am. 2. 15. 21; Prop. 3. 19. 6, and Quint., Dec. 361. 11.

a) PRESENT AND IMPERFECT: the pres. was the first form to find extended use. In early Latin 22 out of 25 are in this tense, and later this was the only tense used by Lucr. (1), Catull. (1), Verg. (1), Prop. (5), Celsus (4), Val. Fl. (1), and Juv.

¹ Cf. Neue III³, p. 162. To the 8 passages cited for Cato add: 30; 100; 142. 3; to the 13 in Sen. phil. add: Dial. 7. 24. 1; Ben. 2. 10. 1; Ep. 99. 23 (76. 21 is cited for 76. 27); and to Blase p. 273 add: Auct. Her. 3. 8; to the 3 in Cic. add: De Or. 2. 99; Att. 12. 34. 3; Fato 27; De Leg. 1. 43 (i. e. in Cic., Rhet. = 4; Epist. = 1; Orat. = 0; Phil. = 2); read Prop. 4. 11. 79; and add Vitruv. 4. 6. 3; 5. 6. 6; 12. 5; 6. 8. 7, all being with *futurus*. Add also to Neue: Ovid, A. A. 2. 287; 350; Celsus, 58. 17; Plin., Nat. 18. 193; Quint. 4. 3. 10; Plin., Ep. 4. 13. 8; Mart. 11. 5. 10; 14. 181.

² Cf. Blase III, p. 222, but note that Ovid, Met. 14. 72 is bracketed, Pont. 2. 11. 19 omitted, as also Sen., Contr. 10. 4. 3; Val. Max. 4. 2. 7; Quint., Decl. 146. 14; 301. 24; Frontinus, 4. 1. 33; and Mart. 11. 91. 9.

(1). Next came the *imperf.* and these two tenses are the only ones used by Ter. (5-1), Auct. Her. (6-2), Sall. (3-2), Nepos (1-7), Pliny, Ep. (8-12), Apul. (2-2), Hor. (3-1), Lucan (1-1). Only the *imperf.* is used by Hirt. (2), Vell. (6), Sen. trag. (2), Frontinus (6). Note that in contrast to Cicero's usage of the pres. 375 times to the *imperf.* 134, Livy used the *imperf.* 127 times to the pres. 52, and that in harmony with Livy's usage stands Nepos 7-1, Vell. 6-0, Val. Max. 14-3, Curt. 13-6, Front. 6-0, Tac. 7-3, Pliny, Ep. 12-8; but in harmony with Cicero's usage Hor. 3-1, Prop. 5-0, Ovid 5-1, Sen. phil. 65-17, Quint. 43-7, and Quint., Decl. 18-6.

*Future Participle with foret.*¹ This form of expression was first used in prose by Sall. (1), Nepos (2), in poetry by Prop. (2. 29. 28), and Ovid (Her. 4. 125). Livy, whose style in a number of details shows an affinity to that of Sallust and Nepos (cf. Lease, Livy (1914), Intr. §§ 27 and 28)² is conspicuous for the frequency with which he used this form³ (2-8-3-1). It is also found in Vell. (2. 37. 3; 55. 3; 90. 3), Val. M. (7. 3. 5), Sen. phil. (1), Curt. (8. 13. 18), Front. (Str. 7. 3. 5), Tac. (Ann. 2. 30; Hist. 4. 86); Gell. (12. 11. 2; 14. 1; 20; Tiro 10. 1. 7), Apul. (1). This form of expression did not find favor with the poets, only three using it, Prop., Ovid, and Lucan (7. 464) and that but once each. For the *gerundive* with *foret*, found in Hor., frequently in Livy, cf. Kühner,² II, 1, p. 168. Compare also its use with *fore*, which appears first in Livy (Schmalz, Synt. 4, p. 463).

b) PERFECT:⁴ this form was used as early as Plautus (Pers. 296), but was not used again in poetry, except once, Ovid, Am. 2. 14. 21 (Martial used it, Bk. II, praef., in prose). In the

¹ Cf. Blase, p. 277, and add the passages cited above in parenthesis.

² So also in the use of the perf. part. with *foret*. Add to Neue pp. 153 f. Sall., Cat. 14. 7; 18. 8; 39. 4; Iug. 21. 2; 27. 2; 30. 1; Nepos, 6. 3. 5; 7. 8. 4; 15. 7. 5; 23. 7. 3.

³ Cf. Neue III, p. 174, who omits 28. 22. 10; 44. 26. 9 and Riemann Et.² p. 231 who omits the latter.

⁴ Blase, p. 278, simply cites the one passage in Plaut., those in Cic., and refers to Neue, III, pp. 164 f. Here Neue cites 3 for Livy, instead of 34 (12-10-8-4), 3 for Sen. phil., omitting Ep. 32. 3; Ben. 3. 8. 4 (Ep. 9. 14 is cited for 9. 17, but here Hense reads *foret*), and 1 for Tac. instead of 6 (cf. G. & Gr. Lex.).

Classical Period Cicero was the only prose writer to use it (17), Ovid the only poet (1). In the Silver Age it was used relatively most frequently by Quint., Decl. 23 (1 in 19. 2 pp.), Livy made a wider use of it (1 in 57. 2) than Cicero (1 in 262. 3). It was also used¹ by Sen. rhet. (2), Val. M. (3), Sen. phil. (4), Curt. (3), Petron. (1), Pliny, Nat. (1), Quint. (5), Tac. (6), Suet. (1), Flor. (1), Just. (1).

c) PLUPERFECT:² This form does not appear until the Classical period and was never common, being found but 8 times in 7717 pages in that period, 13 times in the Silver Age in 13,794 pages. It begins with Cicero (5), Caes. (1), after whom it is used by Vitruv. (1), Ovid (1), Sen. rhet. (2), Livy (6), Vell. (1), Sen. phil. (1), Curt. (1), Quint. (1), Q. Decl. (1). It will be observed that this form is found only once in poetry (Ovid) (in part due to metrical considerations).

III. THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.³

For the sake of brevity and clearness the tabular form of presentation is here adopted. The most important writers in each period and department of literature are here selected for detailed usage. For the present purpose the varied uses of the fut. participle have not been differentiated, but simply classified under the general headings of Adjectival and Substantival. *Futurus* has been treated separately, its purely participial and

¹ Perf. is also used in: Sen., Suas. 2. 7. 10; Contro. 9. 1. 1; Val. Max. 2. 8. 2; 5. 3 ext. 3; 8. 2. 2; Curt. 7. 4. 4; 5. 26; 10. 2. 25; Petron. 101; Pliny, Nat. 17. 155; Quint. 3. 6. 103; 5. 12. 13; 7. 2. 37; 4. 12; 9. 2. 41; Suet., Claud. 38. 3; Florus, 2. 6. 19; Just. 22. 7. 7.

² Blase, p. 228, simply refers to Neue, III^a pp. 165 and 187 (the latter treats the forms *-ndus*). For the citations omitted by Neue cf.: Cic., Fam. 13. 10. 3; (Lig. 23 now has: *fuistis*); Caes., B. G. 1. 40. 13; Vitruv. 10. 22. 9; Ovid, Her. 17. 91; Sen. Contr. 1. 2. 19; exc. 1. 2; Livy, 10. 28. 1; 45. 3; 23. 39. 2; 36. 5. 6; 38. 46. 6; Vell. 2. 125. 1; Sen., Ben. 5. 20. 6; Curt. 6. 8. 10; Quint. 9. 2. 80; and Quint., Decl. 73. 9.

³ Of special value for a study of its varied uses in Cicero are the monographs of F. Hoppe, Gumbinnen, 1875 and 1879; in the Augustan poets, Sommer, Halle, 1881; and for its use to express purpose, R. B. Steele, A. J. P. XIX (1898), pp. 275 ff.; for the literature in general, cf. Nägelsbach Stil.⁹ p. 487.

purely adjectival functions being presented under the category Adjectival.

Future Participle.						Futurus.			
Principal writers.	Pages.	Adj.	1 in pages.	Subst.	1 in pages.	Adj.	1 in pages.	Subst.	1 in pages.
Sall. C. and J.	121	2	60.5	1	121	1	121	0	0
Cicero	4,460	4	111.5	1	4460	68	65.6	72	61.9
Caesar	340	0	0	0	0	1	340	0	0
Nepos	113	0	0	0	0	1	113	0	0
Vitruvius	261	0	0	0	0	3	87	2	130.5
Class. Prose.....	5,700	8	712.5	2	2850	74	77	74	77
Lucr.	198	0	0	0	0	4	49.5	0	0
Vergil.	356	51	6.9	5	71.2	10	22.3	4	89
Horace	262	38	6.9	0	0	3	87.3	4	65.5
Propert.	118	23	5.1	0	0	3	39.3	0	0
Ovid	957	198	4.8	12	79.4	18	52.9	19	50.2
Class. Poetry	2,017	323	6.2	20	100.9	45	44.8	29	69.5
Livy	1,946	120	15.1	2	873	47	41.4	15	129.7
Sen. rhet.	526	43	12.2	8	65.8	13	40.5	11	52.6
Sen. phil.	1,496	283	5.3	44	34	34	44	44	34
Curtius	276	103	2.7	3	92	9	30.7	4	69
Pliny nat.	1,892	51	37.1	8	236.5	12	157.8	9	210.2
Quint.	564	37	15.2	21	26.9	20	28.2	7	80.6
Plin. ep.	380	56	6.8	10	38	7	54.3	9	42.2
Tacitus	600	113	5.3	7	85.7	15	40	21	28.6
Apuleius	642	36	17.8	3	214	18	35.7	7	91.7
Silver Prose.....	11,192	1,121	9.9	118	94.8	229	48.9	141	78.8
Sen. trag.	430	22	19.5	5	86	8	53.8	3	143.3
Lucan.	326	94	3.5	3	108.7	6	54.3	14	23.3
Val. Flacc.	197	12	16.4	4	49.2	2	98.5	6	35.7
Martial.	343	25	13.7	1	343	3	114.3	0	0
Juvenal	105	20	5.3	2	52.5	2	52.5	1	105
Silver Poetry	2,602	303	8.6	21	130.1	44	59.1	38	70.3

A. ADJECTIVAL.

The stylistic possibilities of the future participle were not developed until the Augustan Age. See p. 263. In the *Classical period* it was used by Sall.¹ (2), Cicero (4), Bell. Afr. (2), and

¹ Cf. Sall., B. J. 35. 10; 106. 3 (also Ep. Mith. 18; Hist. 1. 32; 2. 1; cf. Quint. 9. 3. 12); Cic., Verr. 1. 56; Tusc. 4. 14; N. D. 1. 29; Att. 8. 9. 2 (in Ad. Q. Fr. 2. 5. 2 the text is uncertain). Cic. uses only *laturus*, *venturus*, *eventurus*, and *acturus*.

most freely in poetry Verg. (51), Hor. (38), Tib. (11), Lygd. etc. (2), Prop. (23), and Ovid (198). Owing to the influence of poetry and Livy this usage was greatly extended in the *Silver Age*:¹ Livy² (129), Sen. rhet. (43), Vell. (14), Val. Max. (48), Celsus (5), Sen. phil. (283), Curt. (103), Mela (6), Petron. (10), Plin., Nat. (51), Quint.³ (37), Q. Decl. (24), Frontinus (43), Tac. (113), Pliny, Ep. (56), Suet. (44), Florus (9), Just. (6), Gell. (5), Apul. (36), and in poetry, Phaedr. (3), Sen. trag. (22), Lucan (94), Persius (3), Val. Fl. (12), Sil. It. (25), Stat. (99), Mart. (25), and Juv. (20). This usage is found most frequently in Curtius (1 in 2. 7 pp.), Frontinus (3. 3 p.), Just. (4. 5), Sen. phil. and Tac. (5. 3), all historians, and least frequently in Gell. (103. 8), Celsus (72. 4) and Pliny, Nat. (37. 1), which is not surprising considering the technical and impersonal character of the subject-matter.

a) PARTICLES WITH THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE.⁴ The force of the fut. part. is further clarified and accentuated by the use of particles, as by *tamquam*, beginning with Ovid and Livy, by *quasi*, beginning with Ovid and Sen. rhet., by *ut* beginning with Hor., Prop., and Livy, and by *velut* beginning with Livy.

Tamquam, 55 times in prose, but only twice in poetry:⁵ found most frequently in Sen. phil. (17), the nearest being Livy (8), Frontin. (8), and more rarely Val. Max. (4), Quint.,

¹ F. Helm's monograph, *De part. usu Tac., Vell., Sall.* (1879) has been of service in checking up the citations made by the author for these writers.

² Vielhaber, *Liv. Stud.* (Wien) 1871 is far more accurate and complete than Wenger, *Gebr. d. Part. bei Liv.* (Linz), 1882 and Güthling *De T. Liv. Or. Cap. II.* 1872.

³ Quintilian's remark (9. 3. 12) is interesting in view of his own practice.

⁴ Cf. in general Schmalz, *Synt.*⁴ p. 458 and Kühner², II, 1, pp. 790 f., whose citations, however, are far from complete.

⁵ *Tamquam*: Livy, 21. 61. 1; 30. 10. 10; 34. 36. 5; 36. 41. 1; 43. 10; 37. 23. 6; 40. 4. 10; 44. 9. 10; Vell. 2. 109. 1; Val. Max. 2. 6. 11; 3. 2 ext. 3; 9. 6. 2; 9. 12 ext. 10; Sen. phil., N. Q. 30. 2; Dial. 5. 3. 6; 17. 7; 7. 23. 4; 10. 3. 4; Ben. 4. 16. 2; 5. 20. 6; 7; Ep. 21. 1; 32. 1; 46. 1; 59. 14; 70. 17; 82. 21; 98. 5; 5; 123. 10 (over half in his Epist.); Petron. 99; Quint. 6. 1. 39; 9. 2. 82; Quint., Decl. 164. 17; 201. 1; 227. 4; 281. 30; Frontin. 1, [1. 1]; 5. 3; 10; 13; 2. 5. 30; 38; 3. 6. 1; 1; Tac., Ann. 6. 36. 3; 12. 49. 5; 50. 10; 14. 10. 4; 33. 17; Hist. 4. 19. 15; Dial. 2. 16; Pliny, Ep. 2. 20. 11; 6. 33. 2; Gell. 1. 3. 30 *bis*; and Ovid, Met. 10. 269; Juv. 4. 148.

Decl. (4), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (2), Gell. (2), and once each, Vell., Petron., and the two poets Ovid and Juvenal.

Quasi, found 44¹ times (2 in poetry): most frequently in Suet. (16), then Just. (6), and Sen. phil. (5), then Tac. (3), Pliny, Ep. (3), twice each by Sen. rhet., Curt., Front., once each by Val. Max., Florus, Gellius, but in poetry only Ovid, Met. 9. 228; Phaedr. 3. 2. 8 (note that Cicero, Tusc. 5. 81 has *quasi certo futurum* (a subst.)).

Ut, 26 times² (3 in poetry): most often in Livy (7), and Tac. (6), then Just. (4), Pliny, Ep. (3), Sen. rhet. (2), and once each by Val. Max., Sen. phil.; in poetry: Hor., Prop., Lucan.

Velut, 20 times³ (poetry 1): Just. (5), Livy (4), Val. Max. (3), Curt. (2), and once each in Sen. rhet., Sen. phil., Pliny Nat., Quint., Tac.; in poetry, only Lucan, 7. 33.

The following may also be noted: *ceu*: Stat., Th. 9. 67; 11. 362; 561; *dumtaxat* Val. Max. 5. 7. 1; *fortassis* Pliny, Nat. 25. 22 (abl. abs.): *nempe* Sen., N. Q. 6. 32. 10; *nisi* Ovid, Trist. 4. 1. 72; Sen., Dial. 5. 19. 3; Ben. 4. 11. 6; Ep. 29. 1; 97. 6; Pliny, Nat. 11. 54; *perinde ac* Val. M. 8. 11 ext. 2; *prius quam* Livy 7. 31. 2 (cf. 8. 14. 6 with perf.); *proinde* Suet., Iul. 22. 2; *quamlibet* Ovid, Her. 3. 20; *quamvis*⁴ Prop. 1. 15. 13 (in 1. 8. 33 *sc. esset*); *utique* Livy 5. 39. 12; 25. 6. 9; 35. 30. 7.

¹ *Quasi*: Suet., Iul. 81. 4; 82. 1; Tib. 39; 70. 3; 73. 2; Cal. 34. 2; 46; Nero, 40. 3; 47. 3; 57. 1; Galba, 9; 10. 1; Otho, 6. 2; 7. 1; Vit. 15. 4; 17. 1; Just. 16. 4. 20; 22. 2. 10; 26. 1. 7; 7; 27. 3. 1; 29. 2. 8; Sen., N. Q. 3, pr. 4; Dial. 6. 9. 4; 22. 6; Ben. 5. 16. 4; Ep. 22. 14; Tac., Ann. 2. 63; 5. 10; 72; Plin., Ep. 6. 16. 2; Pan. 2. 8; 73. 6; Sen., Cont. 1. 2. 1; 9. 6. 3; Curt. 10. 5. 15; 4. 3. 22 (abl. abs.); Front. 1. 4. 13a; 8. 12; Val. Max. 2. 6. 11; Flor. 3. 20. 9; Gell. 10. 14. 6.

² *Ut*: Livy, 3. 5. 1; 7. 23. 6; 21. 32. 10; 28. 26. 12; 31. 42. 5; 35. 50. 11; 42. 63. 5; Tac., Ann. 1. 47; Hist. 1. 75; 2. 48; 58; 80; 3. 68; Just. 1. 3. 4; 7. 3. 5; 29. 2. 8; Pliny, Ep. 6. 5. 7; 7. 26. 2; Pan. 48. 1; Sen., Suas. 6. 17; Cont. 2. 2. 10; Val. Max. 5. 9. 2; Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 1; Cont. 2. 2. 10; Val. Max. 5. 9. 2; Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 1; and Hor., Sat. 2. 8. 85; Prop. 4. 11. 84; Lucan, 3. 99.

³ *Velut*: Just. 5. 10. 9; 12. 13. 3; 18. 6. 6; 22. 2. 10; 33. 2. 2; Livy, 30. 4. 10; 40. 56. 2; 44. 35. 14; 23; Val. Max. 4. 6, ext. 3; 7. 3. 3; 8. 11, ext. 1; Curt. 7. 4. 5; 9. 7. 19; Sen., cont. 10, pr. 1; Sen., Dial. 12. 10. 9; Plin., Nat. praef. 26; Quint., 8. pr. 18; Tac., Ann. 4. 69.

⁴ Kühner² II, 2, p. 445, says: "*quamvis* c. part. nicht im klass. Spr."

b) FUTURE PARTICIPLE IN ABL. ABS. This construction first appears in literature in Asinius Pollio (Landgraf, Archiv VI, p. 51; cf. XIII, p. 275). It is also found in Prop. 4. 11. 70; Ovid, Her. 18. 111; Met. 8. 409; 6 times in Livy¹ (with tamquam 30. 10. 10; 36. 41. 1); Val. Max. 9. 3 ext. 3 (cf. the pres. in 7. 8. 8); Celsus 83. 23; Curt. 4. 3. 22 (quasi); 5. 10. 7; 8. 6. 15; Pliny, Nat. 18. 341; 19. 189; 25. 22; 11. 54 (nisi); Quint. 6 pr. 3; 12. 10. 73; Front. [1. 11. 15]; 3. 17. 8; Mart. 8. 21. 2; 32. 8. To the 5 cited by Draeger (Synt. Tac.) add: Ann. 12. 25. 8; Hist. 2. 16. 4; 4. 39. 15; and note Ann. 15. 52 *daturis qui*.

c) PECULIAR USAGES. As imitations of the Greek idiom are to be regarded: Plaut., Asin. 364 *daturus dixit*; Prop. 2. 9. 7 *visura speraret* (cf. the perf.: Verg., A. 2. 377 *sensit delapsus*); Stat., Th. 1. 347 *ventura minantur*; 7. 792 *scit peritura* (Prisc., G. L. III, 314, 14 says: *pro scit se perituram*), and Apul., Met. 7. 14 *promitterent habituri*.

d) THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE AS AN APODOSIS.² This usage begins with the Augustan poets Hor. (3), Prop. (1), Ovid (6) and with Livy (15). With ellipsis of the verb it is already found in Sall., Ep. Mith. 12; also in Hor., A. P. 476; Ovid, Met. 6. 207; and Sen., Clem. 1. 4. 1. It is found most often relatively in Curt. 12 (1 in 23 pp.), Tac. 12 (1 in 75), Sen. phil. 15 (1 in 128. 3), Livy 15 (in 129. 7), and Ovid 6 (1 in 158. 3). With this usage is to be compared the frequent use of the fut. part. with *esse* and *est* in apodosis.

B. SUBSTANTIVAL.

The use of the future participle as a substantive first appears in the classical period. A beginning was first made with *futuros* (Sall., Or. Lep. 6) from which this process gradually spread to other participles. In the Classical period *futurus*

¹ Cf. Draeger II², p. 790 and note that in 44. 11. 9 the text has been changed and in 45. 35. 6 the dative is more likely. Cf. also Steele, A. J. P. XXIII (1902), pp. 298 f.

² For its use in general cf. Draeger, II², p. 754, and Kühner² II, 1. 761. Both, however, omit Hor., C. 4. 3. 20; Sat. 1. 6. 130; 10. 89; Prop. 1. 15. 27; Ovid, Met. 5. 270; 9. 562; Trist. 3. 14. 40; Pont. 2. 5. 35; 11. 21; 3. 2. 108. Kühner² cites only 5 occurrences in Livy; there are 15 (5-5-4-1).

constitutes 74 out of 76 participial substantives and it was not until Sen. phil. that the use of other fut. ptcs. has come up to the use of *futurus* (each 44), but by the time of Quintilian other participles are used almost three times (20) as often as *futurus* (8). In poetry *futurus* is generally in the majority, as in Ovid (19-12), Lucan (14-3), Statius (10-4), but in Horace only *futurus* is used, and in Vergil it is used one time less (4-5).

In the *Classical period* this usage (excluding *futurus*) is very rare in prose, being used but twice (Sall., Jug. 1. 5 *profutura*; Cic., De Div. 1. 29 *eventura*), but in poetry¹ ten times as often (Ovid 12, Verg. 5, Tib. 2, Lygd. 1; in the last three, *eventura*, as also Ovid, Pont. 3. 413).

In the *Silver Age*² this usage was widely extended: the rate in the Classical period is 1 in 350. 8 pp., but in the Silver Age 1 in 99. 2 pp. As indicative of the extent to which this usage was developed may be cited such passages as Quint. 11. 3. 157 (cited by Schmalz, Stil.⁴ p. 611), and Sen., Dial. 1. 5. 7 *accepimus peritura perituri*; Tac. Ann. 6. 22 *quin ventura destinentur*; Agr. 18 *tarda bellum inchoaturo*. The substantival use of the participle is found most often in Quint. 21 (1 in 26. 9 pp.), Sen. phil. 44 (1 in 34), Pliny, Ep. 10 (1 in 38), and not at all in three prose writers, Florus, Iustinus and Gellius, and five poets, Lucr., Catull., Hor., Prop., and Sil.; once by Val. Max. (465 pp.), Celsus (362), Mela (79), Frontinus (143), and Phaedrus (50), Persius (19), Martial (343). Besides the writers mentioned in the Table it is also used by Vell. 2 (1 in 47 pp.), Curt. 3 (1 in 98), Petron. 2 (1 in 80), Quint., Decl. 2 (1 in 220. 5), Suet. 2 (1 in 127), and Stat. 4 (1 in 176. 8), Juv. 2 (1 in 52. 5).

The future participle, as frequently the perfect, bears the main idea, in combination with a substantive having the force of an abstract noun, the subst. having the force of a genitive. This usage appears first in Livy³ in prose, in poetry in Vergil,

¹ Cf. Sommer, 1. c.

² Cf. Livy 6. 12. 8; 23. 44. 2 (possibly); Val. Max. 2. 6. 9; Celsus 58. 17; Sen. phil. 44 (N. Q. 3, Dial. 13, Ben. 10, Ep. 18); Pliny, Nat. 18. 26 (cf. Schmalz *ib.*); 19. 87; 20. 45; 125; 136; 193; 25. 56; 37. 169; Petron. 1; 112; Suet., Iul. 23. 2; 52. 1; Apul., Met. 54. 12; 175. 18; 221. 26.

³ Cf. Kühner³, II. 1, pp. 762, 769, and Naegelsbach, Stil.³ p. 150, Anm.

as Geo. 2. 498; 3. 262; 4. 156; Aen. 2. 660; 10. 99; Ovid, Her. 13. 90; 19. 107; Pont. 3. 2. 11; A. A. 3. 59; Met. 13. 162.

a) GENITIVE PLURAL. The ambiguous form in *-orum* is very rare, being found only in Sen., Dial. 9. 14. 7 *periturorum*, Ep. 77. 13 *moriturorum*, and Pliny, Nat. 25. 56 *moriturorum* (M.). Cf. *futurorum* pp. 284 f.

b) WITH PREPOSITIONS. This usage is also very rare, and found only in Sen., N. Q. 2. 59. 7 *inter perituros*; Ep. 91. 13 *inter peritura*; Iust. 11. 15. 6 *apud intellecturum*.

C. FUTURUS.

Futurus was neither used as an adjective nor as a substantive by Auctor ad Her., Hirt., Varro, L. L. (exc. as a *term. tech.*), B. Afr. and Hisp., Mela, Petron., Frontinus, and Florus, and by four poets, Catullus, Tib., Phaedr. and Persius. It was used as an adjective, but not as a substantive, by Sall., Nepos, Vell., Val. Max., Lucr., Prop. and Mart.

a) *Adjectival*.¹ The Adjectival use begins with Lucr. (4) and Sall. (1), and when used in hexameter verse is always placed in the 6th ft., except Ovid, Fast. 4. 572, and Val. Flacc. 6. 313. This use is found most often in Classical poetry, and Silver prose, least often in Classical prose.² Cicero uses it most often, naturally, in his philosophical works (52), 9 in Epist., 4 in Rhet., and 3 in Orat. In the Silver Age³ this usage is

¹ The purely adjectival and the purely participial use of *futurus*, the former being by far the more common, are here grouped together.

² Cf. Sall., Iug. 27. 3; Cic., Inv. 2. 160; De Or. 2. 206; P. O. 13; 111; De Domo 12; Phil. 2. 89; 10. 17; Fam. 4. 3. 1; 6. 4. 1; 10. 10. 1; Att. 4. 8a, 2; 5. 13. 3; 7. 13a, 3; 14. 11. 1; Ad Brut. 1. 16. 11; and 52 in Phil.; Caes., B. C. 1. 52. 1; Nepos 2. 1. 4; Vitruv. 1. 2. 2; 6. 2. 5; 9. 6. 3, and in poetry: Lucr. 3. 484; 823; 972; 5. 98; Hor., C. 3. 29. 29; Ep. 2. 69; Sat. 2. 8. 44; Prop. 3. 11. 5; 22. 42; 4. 4. 63, and Lygd. 3. 36. Inasmuch as the statement has been made that *futurus* was used only with *res*, it is to be especially noted that Cicero uses *futurus* as an adj. not only with *res* but with 20 other substantives.

³ Rarer uses: Vel. 2. 57. 1; 75. 3 *bis*; Pliny, Ep. 3. 18. 2; 6. 2. 2; 9. 3. 10; Pan. 26. 1; 59. 2; 73. 6; 81. 2; Quint. 3. 7. 11; 8. 49; 10. 1. 35; 92; 11. 3. 21; 12. 10. 3; Suet., Iul. 19. 2; 81. 1; Aug. 96. 1; Nero 6. 2; Gell. 14. 1. 33; 36 *bis*; 2. 3; 17. 7. 2; 7, and Sen., Tro. 551; 660; Phoen. 280; Med. 286; H. F. 209; 745; Lucan 4. 204; 710; 5. 179; 7. 374; 389; 9. 581; Val. Fl. 6. 313; 7. 125; Stat., Silv. 4. 3. 18; 5. 3. 176; Th. 6. 293; 12. 760; Argument. 3. 9; Mart. 6. 2. 3; 12. 8. 3; 92. 3; and Juv. 3. 72; 8. 75.

found most frequently in Sil. Ital. 19 (22. 4) and Just. 9 (27. 7), least frequently in Mart. 3 (114. 3), Stat. 5 (141. 4), and Pliny, Nat. 12 (157. 8). The usage of writers other than those recorded in the Table is as follows: Val. Max. 14 (33. 2), Celsus 5 (72. 4), Quint., Decl. 12 (36. 8), Suet. 4 (63. 5), Just. 9 (27. 7), and Gell. 7 (74. 5).

b) *Substantival*.¹ This usage begins with Sall. (Or. Lep. 6) and Cicero in prose, with Verg. and Hor. in poetry, and was used with relatively greater frequency in poetry than in prose.² Of the prose writers it is used, relatively to the number of pages, most often by Tac. (28. 6) and Sen. phil. (34); of the poets most frequently by Lygd. (11), Lucan (23. 3) and Val. Flacc. (35. 7). The usage of writers other than those recorded in the Table is as follows: Celsus 2 (181); Quint., Decl. 3 (147), Suet. 1 (254), Just. 5 (49. 6), Gell. 2 (259. 5), and Sil. Ital. 4 (106. 3); Stat. 10 (70. 7).

The use of *futura* as Nom. (= *res futurae*) is very rare: Cic., Fato 26; 33; P. O. 37 *bis*; Livy 25. 12. 8; Sen., N. Q. 13. 6; Dial. 3. 19. 7; Ep. 99. 5; Lucan 5. 223; Quint. 3. 8. 66.

1) *Futurorum*: this ambiguous form (= *rerum futurarum*) was in general avoided. Cicero, however, who uses *rerum futurarum* 24 times, uses it twice (Att. 15. 4a; Cato M. 78); also Ovid (Met. 13. 722). The other occurrences are in Silver

¹ It is interesting to note that the Latin word from which the common English word "Future" is derived was slow in securing a foothold. Before the Classical Period recourse was generally had to a phrase, *quod restat, in reliquum tempus, in posteritatem*, etc., or to *posthac*. In Cicero *res futuras* (cf. Nepos 2. 1. 4) is common; Lucr. (3. 914), Hor. (C. 3. 29. 29), Ovid (Met. 15. 834), Cic. (P. O. 111) and Caes. (1. 5. 21) use *futurum tempus*; Lucr. (3. 487), Ovid (Her. 4. 131), Lygd. (4. 47) say *aevum futurum*, and Verg. (A. 8. 627) uses *venturum aevum*. Cicero uses the plural *futura* oftener (51) than the sing. *futurum* (10).

² Classical period: only Sall. (Or. Lep. 6), Cicero 72 (Rhet. 6; Orat. 0; Epist. 9; Phil. 57), and Vitruv. 2 (Pr. 3; 9. 6. 2); poetry Verg. 5 (Geo. 4. 239; 392; Aen. 4. 508; 6. 12; 8. 580), Hor. 4 (Sat. 1. 1. 35; 2. 2. 110; A. P. 172; 218); Lygd. 3. 36; Pan. Mess. 33; Ovid 19. Silver Age note: Sen. rhet. Suas. 3. 37; 4. 1 *ter*; 3; 4; 5. 1; Contr. exc. 2. 7; exc. 9. 6. 19; 10. 5. 16; Livy 15 (2-6-4-3); Celsus 32. 18; 81. 13; Sen. phil. 44 (N. Q. 6; Dial. 11; Ep. 22; Ben. 5); Curt. 4. 1. 29; 8. 2. 1; 6. 16; 9. 33; Suet., Nero 56; Gell. 10. 24. 10; 14. 1. 35; Apul., Apol. 50. 11; Phil. 14. 11; 56. 11; 60. 17; 62. 3; 79. 20; 153. 10; and Sen. trag. 3 (H. F. 10. 70; Thyest. 957; Med. 656); Juv. 6. 556.

Latin: Sen., Suas. 3. 7; 4. 1; Sen., Ben. 3. 4. 2; Quint. 5. 10. 33; Quint. Decl. 208. 20; Tac., Ann. 6. 46. 12; Hist. 1. 38; 4. 69. 13; Pliny, Ep. 7. 27. 2; 9. 13. 11; Just. 11. 11. 2; and Apul., Phil. 60. 17; 79. 20. Cf. p. 283.

2) With Prepositions:

a) *In futurum* is the most common (31) and begins with Ovid (1) and Livy (9). It is later used by Sen. rhet. (1), Celsus (1), Sen. phil. (6), Pliny, Nat. (3), Quint. (1), Q. Decl. (2), Tac. (1), Pliny, Ep. (5) and Just. (1). *In futuro* was used only by Cicero (1), *de futuro* by Cic. (2), Sen. phil. (3), Pliny, Nat. (1), and Gell. (1); *pro futuro* (1) and *ex futuro* (2) only by Sen. phil.

b) *Plural*: the most common is *de futuris* Cic. (3), Sen. phil. (1), Quint. (2), Pliny, Ep. (1). *In futuris* (2) and *ex futuris* (1) are used only by Cicero; *in futura* was used only once, by Justinus, and *in futuros*, only once, by Sallust.

It will be observed that *in futurum* is much more common (31) than *in futura* (1); that between *in futuro* (1) and *in futuris* (2) there is little choice; and the same may be said of *de futuro* (7) and *de futuris* (7).¹

This restricted investigation may serve to exhibit in outline what an important rôle the Future Participle plays in the Latin language. A detailed analysis and discussion of its varied uses and of the various syntactic and stylistic problems they present, together with a complete history of their development, would require a separate and more extended treatment.

EMORY B. LEASE.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

¹ *In futurum*: Ovid, Met. 1. 735; Livy 6. 12. 8; 21. 4. 7; 27. 2. 3; 30. 17. 1; 31. 46. 8; 33. 27. 10; 36. 9. 7; 43. 2. 12; 44. 18. 4; Sen., Contr. 10. 5. 16; Celsus 32. 18; Sen., Dial. 4. 2. 14; 9. 9. 2; Ep. 15. 9; 22. 14; 108. 24; 109. 15; Pliny, Nat. 7. 188; 8. 66; 18. 242; Quint. 7. 4. 18; Quint., Decl. 45. 11; 90. 13; Tac., Ann. 4. 37; Pliny, Ep. 6. 5. 2; 8. 2. 7; 14. 1; 10. 101; 115, and Just. 14. 1. 13. *In futuro*: Cic., Fato 17. *De futuro*: Cic., Fato 13; 17; Sen., Dial. 10. 16. 1; Ep. 100. 4; 101. 5; Pliny, Nat. 11. 7; Gell. 10. 24. 10. *Pro futuro*: Sen., Dial. 9. 11. 2. *Ex futuro*: Sen., Ben. 7. 2. 4; Ep. 101. 9. *De futuris*: Cic., P. O. 10; Leg. 3. 29; Phil. 1. 26; Sen. phil., Ep. 88. 33; Quint. 3. 4. 7; 7. 4. 2; Pliny, Ep. 3. 20. 9. *In futuris*: Cic., Fato 13; 17. *Ex futuris*: Cic., Fin. 1. 62. *In futura*: Just. 1. 10. 16. *In post futuros*: Sall. Or. Lep. 6 (note that the subst. still retains its verbal force and allows *post* to modify it; cf. Gell. 14. 1. 6 homines res omnis post futuras praenoscerent).